

Serial No.: 09/802,285
Conf. No.: 6877

- 5 -

Art Unit: 1652

REMARKS

The Examiner has informed the Applicant that the Office Action mailed October 3, 2003 was incorrectly indicated as a Final Office Action. The Examiner has replaced the prior Final Office Action with the non-final Office Action mailed on March 24, 2004. As the substantive contents of the non-final Office Action is the same as the previous Final Office Action, Applicant is resubmitting the Amendment and Declaration filed on February 3, 2004. Applicant is also including a request for a refund of the Request for Continued Examination fee paid in response to the previous Final Office Action. Prior to this amendment, Claims 23, 27, 28, 32-35, and 61-69 were pending in this application. Claims 28, 32-35, 67 and 68 are allowed. Claims 23, 27, 61-66 and 69 are rejected. By this amendment, Applicant is canceling claims 23, 27 and 61-66 without prejudice or disclaimer in order to expedite the prosecution of this application. Applicant maintains the right to pursue the subject matter of the canceled claims in continuing applications. New claims 70 and 71 have been added. Claims 67 and 69 have been amended. Support for the newly added claims and claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and in the claims as originally filed. As a result claims 28, 32-35 and 67-71 are pending for examination with claims 28, 32, and 33 being independent claims. No new matter has been added.

Oath/Declaration

The Examiner has objected to the Supplemental Declaration filed on June 20, 2003 as the declaration did not provide the date of execution for the signature of Ram Sasisekharan. A new Supplemental Declaration is provided herewith to correct for this defect. Applicant maintains that the new Supplemental Declaration is sufficient to overcome the Examiner's objection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for the indication that Claims 28, 32-35, 67 and 68 are allowed.

Serial No.: 09/802,285
Conf. No.: 6877

- 6 -

Art Unit: 1652

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 23, 62-65 and 69 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

Although, Applicant traverses the Examiner's rejection of the claims, in order to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicant has canceled claims 23 and 62-65.

Regarding the rejection of claim 69, Applicant has amended the claim to correct for a typographical error. Claim 69 as amended depends from claim 28 and not claim 29. Applicant maintains that the amendment of claim 69 is sufficient to overcome the Examiner's rejection of this claim.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 23, 62-65 and 69 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for indefiniteness is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

The Examiner has also rejected claims 23, 27 and 61-66 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for not being sufficiently enabled.

Although, Applicant traverses the Examiner's rejection of the claims, in order to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicant has canceled claims 23, 27 and 61-66.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 23, 27 and 61-66 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for not being sufficiently enabled is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 23, 27 and 61-66 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as containing subject matter that was not described in the specification in a way that reasonably conveys to one skilled in the art that Applicant had possession of the claimed invention.

Again, although Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims on this basis, Applicant has canceled claims 23, 27 and 61-66 in order to expedite the prosecution of this application.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 23, 27 and 61-66 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph is respectfully requested.

789628.1

Serial No.: 09/802,285
Conf. No.: 6877

- 7 -

Art Unit: 1652

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Respectfully submitted,
Dongfang Liu, et al., Applicant

By: *Janice A. Vatland*
Janice A. Vatland, Reg. No. 52,318
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2211
Telephone: (617) 646-8000

Docket No.: M0656.70063US00
Date: April 30, 2004
x06/24/04x